



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/524,113	03/13/2000	Jitendra P Patel	6475.US.02	6413
23492	7590	06/03/2003		
STEVEN F. WEINSTOCK ABBOTT LABORATORIES 100 ABBOTT PARK ROAD DEPT. 377/AP6A ABBOTT PARK, IL 60064-6008			EXAMINER BAHAR, MOJDEH	
			ART UNIT 1617	PAPER NUMBER QS
DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Offic Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/524,113	PATEL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mojdeh Bahar	1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears in the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3,7-12 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3,7-12 & 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response to the office action of November 20, 2002 and the amendment adding claim 19, submitted March 19, 2003 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 3 and 7-12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lacy et al. (USPN 5,645,856).

Lacy et al. (USPN 5,645,856) teaches a carrier system for a hydrophobic drug (including fenofibrate) composition comprising (a) a digestible oil (including soybean oil, coconut oil, corn oil, palm oil, cottonseed oil, olive oil, safflower seed oil); (b) a pharmaceutically acceptable surfactant comprising a hydrophilic (including phospholipids, polyethylene sorbitan fatty acid derivatives, castor oil or hydrogenated ester caster oil ethoxylates, fatty acid ethoxylates, alcohol ethoxylates, polyoxyethylene-polyoxypropylene co-polymers and block co-polymers) and a lipophilic surfactant (including propylene glycol), see in particular col. 3, lines 38-67, cols. 5-9 and col. 11, lines 22-23, see col. 21 example 6, lines 21-31.

Lacy et al. (USPN 5,645,856) does not particularly teach an emulsion composition consisting essentially of fenofibrate with the claimed oil and emulsifiers.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to employ fenofibrate in an emulsion composition consisting essentially of the recited oils and emulsifier.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate any of the named hydrophobic drugs in Lacy et al. (USPN 5,645,856) in Lacy's pharmaceutical carrier because Lacy teaches a pharmaceutical combination composition that includes a hydrophobic drug, oil and surfactants (both lipophilic and hydrophilic).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 19, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the surfactants taught in Lacy possess particular qualities, e.g.,

Art Unit: 1617

the hydrophilic surfactant component is such that it does not inhibit the lipolysis of oil not required/claimed herein. Note that Lacy enumerates certain hydrophilic surfactants that are particularly claimed herein, e.g., phospholipids, polyethylene sorbitan fatty acid derivatives, castor oil or hydrogenated ester castor oil ethoxylates, fatty acid ethoxylates, alcohol ethoxylates, polyoxyethylene-polyoxypropylene co-polymers and block co-polymers (see instant claims 19, 1, 7). Note also that the lipophilic surfactant, e.g. propylene glycol, taught by Lacy is also claimed herein (see the instant claim 12). Therefore both the hydrophilic and the lipophilic surfactants of Lacy read on the instant claims.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mojdeh Bahar whose telephone number is (703) 305-1007. The

Art Unit: 1617

examiner can normally be reached on (703) 305-1007 on Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (703) 305-1877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Mojdeh Bahar
Patent Examiner
May 22, 2003



SREENI PADMANABHAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

